

Appln No. 09/607,852  
Amdt. Dated April 26, 2005  
Response to Office Action of March 08, 2005

18

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

#### ***Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103***

We appreciate the Examiner's comments in the "Response to Arguments" section which clearly details why the Examiner does not believe our previous amendments and arguments overcame the objections.

We note that the Examiner indicates that our previous statement acknowledges that Dymetman and Zdybel teach a conferencing form and a recipient conferencing form which each include an identity. We respectfully submit that our intention was to indicate that *if* Dymetman and Zdybel do describe a conferencing form the direct copy will include "the same identity".

In any event, we believe that this is a moot issue as the Examiner has highlighted that the feature was not previously explicit in our claims. We believe that in fact the requirement was inherent by reference to the fact that the claim discussed an identity of the recipient conferencing form and separately discussed an identity of the conferencing form. This is clearly distinct to the combination of Dymetman and Zdybel which could only teach a single identity.

However, the Applicant acknowledges that the claim does not explicitly state that the identities are distinct and accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to specify: "the identity of the recipient conferencing form being different to the identity of the conferencing form". A basis for this can be found on page 22, lines 21 to 31, and page 23, lines 13 to 15, which describe how each page instance has a unique page ID. Furthermore, page 74, lines 8 to 24 describe how different forms have different version numbers. Thus the page ID and version number can form a unique identity different for each version of the form.

In view of this, the requirements is now explicitly set out in the claim and as acknowledged by the Examiner neither of the cited references teach having different identities associated with the conferencing form and a recipient conferencing form.

In view of this, we do not believe that our amendments introduce any new matters for consideration, and additionally believe that the revised claims are novel and inventive over the cited prior art.

Appin No. 09/607,852  
Amdt. Dated April 26, 2005  
Response to Office Action of March 08, 2005

19

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 72, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

PAUL LAPSTUN

---

KIA SILVERBROOK

---

JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762